

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

AGATHA MARTIN WILLIAMS,)	CASE NO. 5:14-cv-1304
)	
)	
PETITIONER,)	JUDGE SARA LIOI
)	
vs.)	
)	ORDER
RONETTE BURKES,)	
)	
)	
RESPONDENT.)	

Before the Court are the following motions: motion to intervene as “plaintiffs” (Doc. No. 34); motion for extension of time to file objections (Doc. No. 41); and motion to correct the case caption on the report and recommendation (“R&R”) (Doc. No. 43).

Doc. No. 41 is denied as moot, since the objections have already been filed. (*See* Doc. No. 42.)


Doc. No. 43 is noted, but denied because the Court will utilize the correct caption when ruling on the objections to the R&R.

Doc. No. 34 is addressed in the R&R, along with the substantive, underlying issues in the case. Although the Court still has under advisement the overall objections to the R&R on the underlying issues, it notes that the objections do not address the R&R’s recommendation with respect to the intervention motion. Any such objection has, therefore, been waived by petitioner. *See United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947 (6th Cir. 1981); *see also Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, *reh’g denied*, 474 U.S. 1111 (1985). The Court has examined the R&R’s recommendation

to deny the motion to intervene because it fails to establish any conditional or unconditional right to intervene under Fed. R. Civ. P. 24. The Court accepts the recommendation, finding it to be correct. Therefore, the motion to intervene is denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 21, 2016


HONORABLE SARA LIOI
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE